IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR.H.L.DATTU
&
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.T.SANKARAN

MONDAY, THE 11TH JUNE 2007 / 21ST JYAISHTA 1929

WP(C).No. 9439 of 2007(S)

PETITIONER:

THE VALLUVANAD WELFARE SOCIETY,
223, KOLAKKADA BUILDING, PATTAMBI ROAD,
PERINTHALMANNA, MALAPPURAM DISTRICT,
REP. BY ITS CONVENER.

BY ADV. SRI.M.P.ASHOK KUMAR

RESPONDENTS:
---

1. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR,
MALAPPURAM DISTRICT.

2. THE DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE,
PERINTHALMANNA, MALAPPURAM DISTRICT.

BY SR. GOVERNMENT PLEADER SMT. MEERA

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 11/06/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

H.L. DATTU, C.J. & K.T. SANKARAN, J.

W.P.(C) No. 9439 of 2007

Dated, this the 11th day of June, 2007

JUDGMENT

H.L. DATTU, CJ.

A non-governmental organization is before us for the following reliefs:

> "a) Issue a writ of prohibition or other appropriate writ or order restraining the respondents from altering the traffic system existing in Perinthalmanna Town as on today.
>
> b) Issue appropriate directions or other orders commanding the 2nd respondent to regulate the traffic reforms in the Perinthalmanna Town junction with an objective of reducing the unnecessary traffic crowd in the town junction, by ordering the stage carriages arriving from the Nilamboor, Melattoor side to directly enter into the Bypass bus stand without encircling the Town junction.
>
> c) Issue appropriate direction to the 2nd respondent to implement the traffic reforms in Perinthalmanna Town uninfluenced by the interference of the traders situated in town junction.
>
> d) Pass such other orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit to grant in the circumstances of the case."

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner vehemently

contends before us that it is the District Collector who is taking initiative in arranging the traffic system in Perinthalmanna Town. For this, the learned counsel would submit that the traffic system requires to be manned only by the police authorities and not by any other person or authority. Since, according to the learned counsel, the District Collector is interfering with the functions of the police, this court should issue appropriate directions.

3. Having heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and having perused the petition averments and the reliefs sought for, we are of the firm opinion that the petition lacks the characteristics of a public interest litigation. The concept of 'public interest litigation' and the locus standi of a person is now succinctly explained by the Apex Court. Keeping in view those observations made by the Apex Court, we are of the opinion that this petition lacks the characteristics of a public interest litigation. Therefore, this petition cannot be entertained by us. Accordingly it requires to be rejected and it is rejected. Ordered accordingly.

H.L. DATTU,
CHIEF JUSTICE.

K.T. SANKARAN,
JUDGE.

mt/